THE ENGLISH CATHOLIC.

The Quarterly Gazette of the Anglican Society.

AUTUMN, 1943. **[WARTIME EDITION. 6d.]** **Vol. 15. No. 55**

President: The Revd. H. ADEANE BYARD, The Vicarage, Newport Pagnell, Bucks.
General Secretary & Hon. Treasurer: The Revd. G. B. TIMMS, 341 London Road, Reading.
Editor: The Revd. A. W. BLANCHETT, Chadlington, Oxford.
Diocesan Organizing Secretaries: List obtainable from the Hon. Secretary.
America: The Revd. F. F. E. BLAKE, 1625 Locust Street, Philadelphia.

THE OBJECTS OF THE SOCIETY ARE: 1.—To promote and preserve the Catholic Faith in strict accordance with the principles laid down by the Book of Common Prayer. 2.—To uphold and appreciate the English use, both in rite and ceremonial.

All who are in sympathy with the Objects of the Society are invited to communicate with the General Secretary. Annual subscription for members, 3/6, which includes subscription to the *English Catholic* (2/- per annum, post free).

GENERAL SECRETARY'S NOTES.

In place of the Annual General Meeting the Emergency Committee met in St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, on Wednesday, June 30th, at 2.30 p.m., to receive the Reports and Financial Statement for the year 1942, the President being in the Chair.

The General Secretary reported that the Society had gained 24 new members during the year, and lost 2 by resignation and death, making a net gain of 22. Thus the upward trend had been maintained, and, he was glad to say, the current year already showed indications of a further welcome increase in membership. At present, however, owing to the difficulty in holding meetings during war-time, the vitality of the Society almost wholly depended upon the quarterly Gazette, so ably edited by Mr. Blanchett. And that, alas, had recently been sadly diminished in size, and impoverished in appearance, at the command of the Paper Controller. Only 15% of the previous weight of paper could now be used, and it was only by dispensing with the covers, using thinner paper, and reducing the number of copies printed from 600 to 425, that a worth-while periodical could still be issued. For continuing to produce so satisfactory a publication in spite of these difficulties, the Society owed deep gratitude both to the Editor and to Messrs. A. T. Broome & Son. But the reduction in the number of copies printed seriously hampered him in his efforts to increase the Society's membership. The free copy previously sent to the Common Room of all theological colleges had now to be withdrawn, and plans for displaying the Gazette in S.P.C.K. Bookshops had to be abandoned for the time being. The President, in congratulating the General Secretary upon what he considered to be a very encouraging and satisfactory report in view of current difficulties, expressed the Society's gratitude to the Honorary Editor and to the Publishers, and called upon Mr. Timms to submit the Financial Statement.

As Honorary Treasurer, Mr. Timms reported that subscriptions received during 1942 numbered 205, compared with 181 in 1941. Nevertheless, there was a slight fall in total receipts, owing to an understandable decrease in donations; cost of printing had risen considerably, and he regretted to have to report a gross loss for 1942 amounting to £8 7s. 10d. This had been met by the balance of £3 9s. 10d. brought forward from 1941, and by drawing on a special donation of £25 which a member, who wished to remain anonymous, had most generously subscribed. So far, during the current year (1943) subscriptions had been coming in fairly well, and with a decrease in cost of printing owing to the reduced size of the Gazette, he hoped next time to be able to report that we had paid our way. The Financial Report was adopted, and Mr. A. J. Chadwick, of Reading, re-elected Honorary Auditor.

The President then raised the important question of the Society's official attitude to the South India Scheme and the recent Church Assembly resolution on "Interchange of Pulpits." After discussion, Dr. Moss kindly acceded to the President's request that he should prepare a draft Statement, to be circularised to members of the Executive Committee for their comment, with a view to eventual publication in the ecclesiastical Press. The meeting closed at 4.0 p.m.

A meeting of members of the Anglican Society will be held at 5 Little Cloister, Westminster Abbey (by courtesy of Dr. Perkins), on Tuesday, October 19th, at 3 p.m. All members living in the London Diocese are urged to attend in view of the business to be transacted. Members and friends not living in the London Diocese will be welcomed. Chair to be taken by the Revd. H. Adeane Byard.

G B TIMMS.

341 London Road, Reading.

THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.

III. *The Sacrifice of the Mass in the Middle Ages.*

It would take us too far afield to consider the stages by which the "western" or mediaeval theory of the sacrifice of the Mass was evolved. Dr. Hicks in his *The Fullness of Sacrifice,* discusses the matter at some length. While the pagan and Jewish sacrifices continued there was no real ignorance of the full meaning of sacrifice. The Christian writers who lived in the primitive Church knew it only too well; and they did not dissociate one stage in the sacrificial action from another. They knew the meaning of the use of blood, and the act of offering, and the feeding upon the victim. But as the animal sacrifices died out and Christianity spread throughout the Roman Empire there comes a gradual weakening of the full conception of sacrifice and emphasis is thrown more and more upon the idea of our Lord's *Death* as the climax and only meaning of sacrifice. Thus the ancient technique of sacrifice was forgotten. We may say that the full technique of sacrifice was gradually telescoped into "Death."

It is not until the thirteenth century that we encounter the complete theory and doctrine of sacrifice as Death. This of course we find in St. Thomas Aquinas. But from the Carolingian Renaissance in the Ninth century the death theory is in evidence as a growing tradition; and Aquinas' doctrine is really the official acceptance and rationalization of what had grown up in popular belief. Peter Lombard (d. 1160) says "On the Cross Christ died once and then he was immolated in himself; in the Sacrament he is immolated daily." As Dr. Hicks points out the weakness of the mediaeval theory in restricting sacrifice to death is that it leaves out the connection of the Eucharist with the rest of our Lord's redeeming work (*The Fullness of Sacrifice,* p. 308). It is not of course that the mediævalists ignored Christ ascended into the heavens; but as sacrifice had come to mean death, it meant also that somehow there was a fresh immolation, a fresh killing, every time mass was offered upon the altars of the Church. The separation of Christ's high priestly work in the heavens from the sacrifice of the mass meant, in popular thought, at any rate, that there were two "Bodies of Christ." On the one hand there was the glorified Christ of rhe heavenlies; while on the other hand there was the "sacramental" Christ. It is true that there was the subtle theory of transubstantiation which attempted to set the "death" theory on a philosophical tasis. The death theory of sacrifice is besponsible for the difficulties of the Real Presence. For under such a theory it is almost impossible to escape the idea of there being two Christs. Far more attention has been paid in the working out of eucharistic theology as well as in popular devotion, to the Presence in the Eucharist than to Sacrifice. It has widely escaped observation that theories of the nature of the Presence largely depend upon theories of sacrifice. On the other hand Eastern Christendom has preserved something, if not all of the more adequate ideas of sacrifice; and Orthodox worship in the eucharist is that of the lifting up of the worshippers to the Heavenlies rather than the bringing down of the Lord to earth. But in the West the Christ who was sacrificed in the Mass was the Victim of the Cross. Therefore it was his Body in death that concerned the mediævalist both in the elements on the altar and in the Communion. It was the Body of his pre-Resurrection state, the Body of Humiliation. It is not surprising therefore that the acceptance of this idea of the Presence should lead

to a materialistic view of "Corpus Christi." The very fear of this materialism created in the minds of the critical doubts about the reality of the Presence. The legalistic theories of our Lord's Atonement are in some part responsible for the difficulties connected with the sacrifice in the mass of the middle ages. It is of importance that the doctrine of the Eucharist should be properly related to our Lord's Incarnation and his work of Atonement, and Redemption from sin.

(*To be continued*).

CONVOCATION.

The Convocations are the ancient Provincial Synods of Canterbury and York. According to the Canons of 1604, the Convocations, sitting together as a National Synod, are the true Church of England by representation, and anyone who denies this is *ipso facto* excommunicated.

The Convocations are therefore the legislative body of the English Church. They alone can pass canons, which are the laws of the Church. But they are not a Church Parliament. Unlike Parliament, their power to legislate is limited in various ways, as we shall see. But in any case, the Synods of the Church have not altogether the same functions as a Parliament. The function of Parliament, as now understood, is to carry out the will of the electors. But the first duty of Synods is to maintain the faith, morals, and discipline given once for all to the Apostles. The Church is not, and cannot be, a democracy, though it may have a democratic element in its constitution. It is a theocracy, and its rulers are bound by Holy Scripture and the traditional Faith contained therein.

Provincial Synods are first heard of in the 2nd century. Before the rise of the Papacy, before the Christian Empire began to be identified with the Church, its ordinary government was conducted by provincial and other regional synods. General Councils were extra-ordinary, summoned to deal with some special crisis: and never at any period formed the ordinary government of the Church. The voting members of Provincial Synods were diocesan bishops only. Priests, deacons, and laymen were sometimes allowed to attend and speak: sometimes the general assent of the laity was asked for the decisions of the synod. But bishops alone were members. Resolutions were not carried by majorities. What was aimed at was general agreement, the feeling of the house. The facts will be found, with full references, in Bishop Maclean's essay in "Episcopacy" (ed. Jenkins and Mackenzie, S.P.C.K., 1930).

The first Provincial Synod held in England was the Synod of Hertford in 673. It was the first assembly of any kind in which the whole English nation was represented. York did not become a separate province until 735. After that, though provincial synods were still held, national synods were more usual. They seem to have been discontinued after the Danish invasions, but were revived by the Normans. Sometimes, because of the jealousy between the two archbishops, the president was a papal legate, who, from the Roman standpoint (though not from that of English civil law), ranked above the archbishops.

In the 13th century the lower clergy were summoned to send representatives to the provincial synods. At that time, and until after the Restoration, the clergy did not pay the ordinary taxes, but voted their own taxes in Convocation. The constitution and procedure of the Convocations have not been much changed since the reign of Edward I. The Lower Houses acquired the right of veto on the decisions passed by the bishops. This right of veto does not exist elsewhere, but it has been a valuable safeguard, because bishops appointed by the Crown have often tried to pass legislation contrary to the wishes of the Church.

Henry VIII, by a dishonest trick, forced the Convocations to promise not to meet or to enact any canons without the royal consent. This promise was made statute law in 1534: and in consequence the Convocations can neither meet nor pass any canons without the permission of the Prime Minister, to whom the rights of the Crown have passed. Elizabeth, once her settlement had been carried through in the teeth of the Marian Convocations, would not allow Parliament to take any steps with regard to religion until they had first been accepted by Convocation. The Prayer Book and the Articles were thus accepted by Convocation before being submitted to Parliament. In the period after the Revolution there were sharp disputes between the latitudinarian Upper Houses and the high-church Lower Houses. In 1717 the Convocation of

Canterbury was prorogued by the Crown to prevent an attack on Bishop Hoadly, and until 1852 both Convocations only met for formal business. Boswell once told Dr. Johnson, as a great joke, that he had been told that the Doctor had said he would stand before a battery of cannon for the restoration of Convocation. To his amazement, the old man exclaimed, " And would I not, Sir? Shall the Kirk of Scotland have its General Assembly, and the Church of England not have its Convocation ?"

Through the efforts of Bishop Wilberforce and Henry Hoare, the Convocation of Canterbury resumed its activities in 1851, and the Convocation of York followed in 1861. Since then the Convocations have passed a number of canons, and the Convocation of Canterbury formally rejected the decrees of the Vatican Council. In all questions of reunion, it is Convocation which decides: the restoration of communion with Utrecht and the Old Catholics was passed unanimously by both Convocations, and so were the partial agreements with the Churches of Finland and the Baltic States. As was shown in a previous article, the Revised Prayer-Book of 1928, after it had been rejected by the House of Commons, was in 1929 accepted by the Convocations (Lower as well as Upper Houses) as marking the extent of deviation permissible from the existing Prayer-Book : so that though no one can be compelled to use it, no one can be forbidden to use it either.

The Church Assembly is a modern institution, consisting of all the members of the four Houses of Convocation together with representatives of the laity. It cannot pass canons, but by the Enabling Act it can pass Measures, which if passed as they stand by both Houses of Parliament, become statute law. Thus the long and expensive process of passing an Act of Parliament through three readings in each House is avoided. In this and other ways the Church Assembly is very useful, though it has never won the complete confidence of the Church. But it is not a Synod, and cannot take the place of the Convocations. The ancient Provincial Synods were limited by the decisions of larger synods. But the Anglican Communion has laid down the principle that local and national churches are free to make their own laws, provided that they are not contrary to Scripture : and has rejected such larger synods as those of the Lateran, Constance, and Trent. We cannot be bound by the synods of churches with which we are not in Communion. Our Provincial Synod must not pass anything contrary to the doctrinal decrees of the Œcumenical Councils which we have accepted as agreeing with Scripture : or anything which would affect the validity of our sacraments in the eyes of others (such as the admission of women to the priesthood or the diaconate). But beyond these limits they are not bound by the decrees of any larger synods. The Lambeth Conference is not a synod : it has always refused to exercise legislative powers, and the independent spirit of some of the Anglican churches will not permit it to do so. Therefore our Provincial Synods are our final legislative authority. This makes it all the more important that both their members and the English Church as a whole should take them very seriously ; for in them alone we hear the living voice of the Church.

The laws of the Church can only be enforced with the help of the State. We cannot expect, and we ought not to expect, the modern secular State to enforce the doctrine and discipline of the Church ; Caesar should have no power over the things of God. Acts of Convocation have no legal force (as Archbishop Lang said once) : even when, with the assent of the Crown, they are promulgated as canons, it is doubtful whether the civil courts would compel the clergy to obey them, and certain that the civil courts would not enforce them on the laity. The power of the Convocations can only be exercised through the conscience. It ought to be generally felt that the decisions of Convocation bind our consciences, no matter what Crown or Parliament may do, because they are the decisions of the Church.

But before this can happen, there must be a great change in the conduct of Convocation and in the attitude of the clergy and laity towards it. The number of official members has been much lessened in recent times : but it is still far too great. I am quite sure that the bishops as a body will never have the full confidence of the Church, until it has a decisive voice in their appointment : but this is not the place to press that point. We also need a very much stronger sense of Church membership. Many of us, especially among the laity, still do not realize that the State is secular, that the various Christian ceremonies which it uses

only mask its secular character, and that to appeal from the Church to Parliament is what St. Paul called "going to law before the unrighteous." Ancient synods were chiefly occupied with questions of doctrine and discipline; and these are the proper business of Convocation. But if it is to decide them properly, every proctor must know what the faith and order of the Church are.

Modern Anglican assemblies are much more occupied with administration, and with the raising and spending of money. The Church Assembly is more suitable than Convocation for these purposes; but we might well enquire why the Church Assembly is less efficient, and less generally trusted, than, say, the "General Synod" of the Church of Ireland, (which, in spite of its name, is a Church Parliament rather than a Synod, and has no continuity with the ancient Irish Provincial Synods). The laity must be consulted in all matters that directly concern them (that is, the faithful, not the merely nominal adherents). But in modern conditions most questions of doctrine and discipline chiefly concern the clergy, and are therefore proper subjects for Convocation rather than the Church Assembly.

But what is above all needed is a general recognition that the Convocations have the last word. For if the voice of the Church is not to be found in the Convocations, where is it to be found? Certainly not in the Crown, or in Parliament; nor in the personal authority of individual bishops; still less in the Papacy, or any of its "Congregations." No Œcumenical Council is likely to meet in our time, nor would its decisions bind us till it was accepted by all the local churches, in our case by the Convocations. It is no use talking about reunion, unless we have a recognized organ by which the Church of England can accept any proposals for reunion; and that organ can only be the Convocations. Therefore we must, by every means in our power, make the Convocations such that all Churchmen will obey them: for Englishmen will not obey any authority, however legal, unless it has their confidence.

C. B. Moss.

THE ANGLICAN CONTRIBUTION TO REUNION AMONG THE "REFORMED" CHURCHES.

While I have been unable to keep up-to-date with the latest details of the schemes for reunion between Anglicans and non-episcopal bodies, recent reports of them are gravely disquieting from more than one point of view. It is not merely that the arrangements proposed seem to be destructive of our catholic heritage, not only that the majority of our representatives in the negociations have shown scant knowledge or appreciation of that heritage themselves, but that those of us to whom it is very dear have apparently failed to convey to the rest of the Christian world any useful idea of the nature of what that heritage is. We have allowed them to think that we are obstinately sticking to some rather stupid and unkind rules from a mere arid conservatism. Here I wish only to direct the thoughts and prayers of our readers to the urgent necessity of repairing this omission, and to hazard a few suggestions as to what may be the most hopeful approach.

It will probably be agreed on all sides that in any attempt to heal any of the divisions of Christendom it should be the aim of each body taking part to bring all that is best of its own special tradition into the common treasury, and to consign to oblivion only what is indifferent or bad. To allow anything of value to be lost would be a betrayal of the united church; and the consent of the uniting elements would not be sufficient to rebut the charge of breach of trust even to them, if at the time of the consent they were unaware of the value of the thing they were losing.

We need not attempt to deny that there is much in Anglicanism which any united Church might be better without. The subservience of the Church of England to the British Parliament is an example that leaps to mind. But at the same time we must firmly assert that the Christians in visible communion with the See of Canterbury are heirs to certain treasures of permanent value to Christendom which it is their duty to contribute to any union of themselves with their non-episcopal brethren. The two that I should like to consider here are the Apostolic Succession and what we may call the sacramental pattern of Life.

The subject of the metaphysical relationship of the "sign" to the "thing signified"

in the sacraments has been worn pretty well threadbare in the last few centuries, and I do not wish to refer to it again more than incidentally; nor do I wish to attempt even to outline the theology of the individual sacraments; but I do want to draw attention to the position occupied by the sacramental system as a whole.

To us the sacraments taken collectively are a pattern of the whole Christian life, which is to say, of the life of Christ as shown in His Church. They are of course a symbolical representation of it, but they are also a most effective means of producing it if sincerely used, and one that we neglect at our peril. We believe this not only on philosophical and psychological grounds, though these are very strong, but on the strength of the tradition of Christendom and our reading of Holy Scripture.

To obtain the broad outline of the pattern of life so represented it is only necessary to consider the two greater sacraments. It begins with a washing from the evil world, not to say a drowning, a death, to it. And it is a new life, a life of another order, the life of the Holy Spirit of God. (There are many ways in which water is associated with the idea of life, but the full force of the symbolism is perhaps only felt by those who live in a climate with a definite wet and dry season and who yearly, at the first rains, look for the resurrection of the land as from the tomb.)

This life is carried on in constant union with Christ, feeding on His Body and Blood as the branch lives on the tree, relying on and sharing in His Redemptive action in His broken Body and shed Blood, partaking to some extent in His Resurrection even here in earth, where the Blood, which is the Life, meets the Body again, and lives in the faithful communicants. His Body and Blood are the Bread of Life and the Wine that makes us glad.

Now it will be said that this life can be lived without participation in the sacramental representation of it, and the best catholic theology has always admitted that, with important reservations. It has taught that the just and merciful God will find special means to communicate His gifts and Himself to those who are cut off from the normal channels *through no fault of their own*, but it has also taught "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God," and it has never admitted that where the sacraments were available they could be neglected with impunity.

We hear that it is proposed that in South India unbaptized persons should be allowed to partake of the Holy Mysteries, and even to preside at them. Certainly a man who cannot accept the catholic doctrine of Holy Baptism may yet have entered upon the christian life. His convictions are a bar to his receiving the sacrament of Baptism, and, if they are humbly and sincerely held and coupled with a resolution to seek and embrace the truth whatever it may be, they cannot involve him in any guilt. Incidentally it is a little difficult to understand what convictions forbid a man to express his acceptance of the Christian life by accepting Holy Baptism, and yet allow him to express his continuance of that life by receiving Holy Communion.

But what can be the meaning of the communion made by such a person? Leaving aside altogether any question of the validity or efficacy of the sacraments and considering the signs only, what connotation can the signs possibly have when so used?

If the sacraments mean what we take them to mean, the communion of an unbaptized person means living in Christ without dying to the world; without being regrafted into Christ. It is a continuation of what has never been begun. It is idle to reply that the person may in fact have begun the Christian life and even progressed far in it; that does not affect the meaning—or lack of meaning—of the ceremony he goes through. Such a communion so-called is primarily an absurdity and only secondarily a sacrilege, in that it is sacrilege to make holy things absurd. We need not argue about the presence of the "thing signified," if we are going to treat the very signs as though they signified nothing. This communion of the unbaptized is to us like some shapeless fragment of a shattered masterpiece—meaningless, except that it means the masterpiece, the sacramental system, has been destroyed. It is our bounden duty to deliver it intact.

N. P. BRUCE.

(*To be concluded.*)

WHAT WAS THE ATONING SACRIFICE?

The Church of the Middle Ages (and possibly the majority of so-called Evangelicals of to-day) tended to stop short at the Cross, as though that were the be-all and end-all of our Lord's work of atonement. That work, however, neither began nor ended on Calvary's hill. But before discussing the actual nature of the Atoning Sacrifice I would underline certain relevant facts that bear upon it.

(*a*) In the Levitical system of sacrifice, the altar was not the place of slaughter but the table of offering. In the Old Testament "altar" and "Lord's table" are interchangeable terms (see Malachi i. 7, 12; Ezekiel xli. 22; *Cf.* Ezek. xliv. 16). Even the table of shewbread is termed an altar (I Kings vi. 20). When the sacrifice was that of an animal, the latter was killed, not upon the altar, but at a place apart (see Leviticus i, 11.).

(*b*) In animal sacrifices the victim was killed by the offerer, and not by the priest (Lev. i, iii, iv.) For death, though an essential part of such sacrifices, was not that which was held to make atonement. The animal was slain in order that its blood might be set free. It was not the death of the victim, but the manipulation of the blood by the priest* that was regarded as the expiatory feature of the sacrifice. For to the Jewish mind the blood was the life; the life came from God; and consequently the blood was holy, having power to propitiate Him. (See Genesis ix, 4, Deuteronomy xii. 23, and especially Leviticus xvii. 11, 14).

(*c*) "Sacrifice" is not (as is still so commonly imagined) synonymous with "slaughter," and did not necessarily involve the shedding of blood. The same Hebrew word (minchah) is used both of Abel's sacrifice of the firstlings of the flock and of Cain's sacrifice of the fruits of the ground. Webster's Dictionary (1920 ed.) defines a sacrifice as "an offering to a deity of animal or vegetable life, or of food, incense, or the like." Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* defines it as "an act, belonging to the sphere of worship, in which a material oblation is presented to the Deity and consumed in His service, and which has as its object to secure through communion with a Divine being the boon of His favour." Or we might express it more briefly by saying that a sacrifice is an offering of any kind made by man to God, whereby man achieves communion or fellowship with God. More shortly still, sacrifice means offering, not slaughter. Incidentally, if only this fact were everywhere realized, Protestant suspicion anent the term "Eucharistic Sacrifice" might tend to disappear.

Bearing the above facts in mind, let us now consider the nature of the Atoning Sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ. While death was an essential part of that Sacrifice, it was far from forming the whole of it; for, as we have seen, sacrifice is by no means synonymous with death. Assuming (as we Christians are bound to assume) that there was some form of sacrifice or offering so acceptable to God as to win from Him forgiveness, and to make us *at one* with Him, what form should we expect that offering to take?

There can surely be no reasonable doubt regarding the answer to this query. Remembering that God had made mankind to be His children, loving, dutiful, obedient, using His gift of freewill aright, ever spurning temptation aside, ever heeding the still small voice of the Spirit, and thus ever drawing nearer to Himself; remembering, on the other hand, that all human beings had failed in greater or less degree to accomplish the Divine purpose, may we not say with considerable confidence that the sacrifice which would be more acceptable to Him than any other would be *the offering of a perfect life*, a life lived from the cradle to the grave in absolute conformity with His Divine will? But no son of Adam could offer such a sacrifice as this, for every one was stained—to some extent at least—with the guilt of sin. Therefore it was that God the Son took our human nature upon Him in order that, as Representative Man, He might offer on our behalf this Perfect Sacrifice, viz. the Perfect Self-Sacrifice. "Then said I, Lo, I come—in the volume of the book it is written of me—that I should fulfil thy will, O my God." (Psalm xl. 9 *f.*) Or, to quote our Lord's own words: "My meat is to do the will of Him that sent Me, and to accomplish His work." (Jn. iv, 34).

* The details of this varied according to the type of sacrifice. Incidentally, as may be seen by a study of the opening chapters of Leviticus, there were no less than six (in the case of the "Burnt Offering" five only) actions or stages, viz. the entrance of the victim, the laying on of hands, the slaying, the manipulation or offering of the blood, the burning of a portion of the flesh upon the altar, and the sacrificial feast. In the case of the "Burnt Offering," the last step was omitted, the entire victim being offered to God.

Such, in brief, surely, was the nature of the Atoning Sacrifice. It consisted in the offering of a Perfect Life, a life which began at Bethlehem and was consummated on Calvary's hill, lived in unquestioning obedience to the will of His Heavenly Father. Death was indeed an essential part of that Sacrifice. Here we have a sacred mystery, and it is with diffidence that I suggest three reasons. (1) Having voluntarily taken upon Him our human nature in all its fullness, He must of necessity suffer the common lot of humanity. (2) He was to prove Himself the Conqueror of death. He would not do this by evading it, but rather by meeting it face to face and proving that it was powerless to hold Him (*Cf.* Ps. xvi. 11, Acts ii, 24). (3) In order that the blood (i.e. the life) might be set free to return to God. Passage after passage in the New Testament stresses the fact that it was the *blood* of Christ that made atonement for us sinners. But this is not tantamount to death, as we have seen. When St. John, for example, writes : " The blood of Jesus, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin " (I Jn. i, 7), he, as a Jew, would regard the blood as *the risen life.* And here we see the grave mistake of stopping short at the Cross. We must never think of our Lord's death apart from His Resurrection. It was not the actual death, but rather the victory over death, that makes us Christians heirs of eternal life. Our Lord Himself expressly tells us so :—" Because I live, ye shall live also." (Jn. xiv. 19). He did not say, " Because I die," but rather, " Because I triumph over death, ye who believe in Me shall share in My triumph ; ye shall live also."

G. F. POLLARD.

N.B.—In the 1662 Liturgy, the Anamnesis is whittled down to a bare " remembrance of His death and passion." This is bad theology. The Canon of 1928 very rightly amends it as follows :—" Having in remembrance the precious death and passion of Thy dear Son, His mighty resurrection and glorious ascension . . ."

THE ANGLICAN SOCIETY.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURE ACCOUNT FOR THE YEAR ENDED DECEMBER 31ST, 1942.

Expenditure.

	£	s.	d.
To Printing and Postage of " The English Catholic "	76	11	2½
,, Expenses Annual Meeting ...		8	6
,, Stationery		5	8
,, Postages	1	9	0
,, Notices, etc.		10	11
,, Cheque Book		4	2
	£79	9	5½

Income.

	£	s.	d.
By Balance as at 1/1/42	3	9	10
,, Subscriptions and Donations ...	50	2	6
,, Subscriptions through Publisher...	6	15	7½
,, Subscriptions from American Branch	14	3	6
,, Balance—Net loss for year ...	4	18	0
	£79	9	5½

BALANCE SHEET AS AT DECEMBER 31ST, 1942.

Liabilities.

	£	s.	d.
Reserve Fund	22	10	2
Donation	25	0	0
	47	10	2
Less, Net loss Income and Expenditure Account	4	18	0
	£42	12	2

Assets.

	£	s.	d.
Cash at Post Office	22	10	2
Cash at Barclays Bank	20	2	0
	£42	12	2

Auditor's Report.

I have compiled the foregoing accounts from the books, accounts and information given me, and certify them to be correct according to the informtaion and explanations given to me, and as shown by the books of the Society.

A. J. CHADWICK,
Auditor and Accountant.

July 25, 1943.

Printed and published by
A. T. BROOME & SON, The Cherwell Press, 18 St. Clement's Street, Oxford.